



NUMBER FOUR

JANUARY, 1961

EDITORIAL

Manifesto

2

TOUSSAINT

The United Nations : Illusion and Reality

6

B. RADEBE

South West Africa : Test Case for UNO and Africa

18

F. KUMALO

Socialism for Africa

31

JALANG KWENA

Marxist Education series : No. 1.

Why You Should be a Communist

40

Published in the interests of African solidarity and as a forum for Marxist-Leninist thought throughout our Continent, by the

SOUTH AFRICAN COMMUNIST PARTY.

Copies of THE AFRICAN COMMUNIST will be sent to any part of Africa for one shilling and six pence (British Postal Order) each, or ten shillings a dozen. The subscription rate is six shillings a year (four issues) or fifteen shillings by airmail. Send British Postal Order to our London agent :—

**Mr. Ellis Bowles,
52 Palmerston Road,
East Sheen,
London, S.W.14.**

Articles are invited for publication, as well as correspondence on all themes of African interest.

As our Party is illegal, all correspondence must be sent to our London Agent, whose address appears above.

OUR MAGAZINE

Communism has become the vital social and political belief of our times. Already one third of mankind has chosen the road to socialism under the leading banners of the Marxist parties. Everywhere else, millions of men and women press forward to their liberation, inspired by the parties of Communism.

In this, as in so much else, Africa lags behind the world. The forces of imperialism, which have made Africa the "dark continent", have also kept the people curtailed off from the liberating spirit of Communism.

This magazine, "THE AFRICAN COMMUNIST", has been started by the South African Communist Party, to defend and spread the inspiring and liberating ideas of Communism in our great continent, and to apply the brilliant scientific method of Marxism to the solution of its problems.

It is being produced in conditions of great difficulty and danger. Nevertheless, we mean to go on publishing it, because we know Africa needs Communist thought, as dry and thirsty soil needs rain.

To you, the reader, we say, comrade and fellow-worker, wherever you may be, read and study this magazine. Pass it on to other fellow-workers and form groups to discuss it. These groups may become the foundation-stones of great and important Communist Parties in many lands that will bring salvation to your country.

The "AFRICAN COMMUNIST" has been hailed with joy by revolutionary workers and intellectuals in many parts of our great continent. It has been, in the words of one reader, "like a ray of sunlight piercing through the dark".

"How can I get more copies?" ask other readers. "How can I send an article to your magazine?" This was difficult, because we could not put any address on our first two issues. We have overcome this difficulty by appointing a London agent for our magazine to whom you can write. His address appears on the inside back cover.

Manifesto for Colonial Freedom

No political statement in recent history has made so profound an impact on the whole world as that which emerged on December 6, 1960 from the Moscow talks between representatives of 81 Communist and Workers' Parties, representing 36 million members. The document underlines the fact that : "The world Communist movement has become the most influential political force of our time".

Of its 20,000 words a most striking section (reproduced below) is that devoted to the next steps in the struggle for national liberation. Africa is the heart of this struggle. Every African freedom-fighter will derive new inspiration and strength from a serious study of this section — and even more when able to procure and read the whole document.

National liberation revolutions have triumphed in vast areas of the world. About forty new sovereign states have arisen in Asia and Africa in the fifteen postwar years. The victory of the Cuban revolution has powerfully stimulated the struggle of the Latin American peoples for complete national independence. A new historical period has set in in the life of mankind : the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America that have won their freedom have begun to take an active part in world politics.

The complete collapse of colonialism is imminent. The breakdown of the system of colonial slavery under the impact of the national liberation movement is a development ranking second in historic importance only to the formation of the world socialist system.

The Great October Socialist Revolution aroused the East and drew the colonial peoples into the common current of the worldwide revolutionary movement. This development was greatly facilitated by the Soviet Union's victory in the Second World War, the establishment of people's democracy in a number of European and Asian countries, the triumph of the socialist revolution in China, and the formation of the world socialist system. The forces of world socialism contributed decisively to the struggle of the colonial and dependent peoples for liberation from imperialist oppression. The socialist system has become a reliable shield for the independent national development of the peoples who have won freedom. The national liberation movement receives powerful support from the international working-class movement.

The face of Asia has changed radically. The colonial order is collapsing in Africa. A front of active struggle against imperialism has opened in Latin America. Hundreds of millions of people in Asia, Africa and other parts of the world have won their independence in hard-fought battles with imperialism. Communists have always recognised the progressive, revolutionary significance of national liberation wars; they are the most active champions of national independence. The existence of the world socialist system and the weakening of the positions of imperialism have provided the oppressed peoples with new opportunities of winning independence.

The peoples of the colonial countries win their independence both

through armed struggle and by non-military methods, depending on the specific conditions in the country concerned. They secure durable victory through a powerful national liberation movement. The colonial powers never bestow freedom on the colonial peoples and never leave of their own free will the countries they are exploiting.

The United States is the mainstay of colonialism today. The imperialists, headed by the U.S.A., make desperate efforts to preserve colonial exploitation of the peoples of the former colonies by new methods and in new forms. The monopolies try to retain their hold on the levers of economic control and political influence in Asian, African and Latin American countries. These efforts are aimed at preserving their positions in the economy of the countries which have gained freedom, and at capturing new positions under the guise of economic "aid", drawing them into military blocs, implanting military dictatorships and setting up war bases there. The imperialists endeavour to emasculate and undermine the national sovereignty of the newly-free countries, to misrepresent the principle of self-determination of actions, to impose new forms of colonial domination under the spurious slogan of "inter-dependence", to put their puppets in power in these countries and bribe a section of the bourgeoisie. They resort to the poisoned weapon of national strife to undermine the young states that are not yet strong enough. They make ample use of aggressive military blocs and bilateral aggressive military alliances to achieve these ends. The imperialists' accomplices are the most reactionary sections of the local exploiting classes.

The urgent tasks of national rebirth facing the countries that have shaken off the colonial yoke cannot be effectively accomplished unless a determined struggle is waged against imperialism and the remnants of feudalism by all the patriotic forces of the nations united in a single national democratic front. The national democratic tasks on the basis of which the progressive forces of the nation can and do unite in the countries which have won their freedom, are : the consolidation of political independence, the carrying out of agrarian reforms in the interest of the peasantry, elimination of the survivals of feudalism, the uprooting of imperialist economic domination, the restriction of foreign monopolies and their expulsion from the national economy, the creation and development of a national industry, improvement of the living standard, the democratisation of social life, the pursuance of an independent and peaceful foreign policy, and the development of economic and cultural co-operation with the socialist and other friendly countries.

The working class, which has played an outstanding role in the fight for national liberation, demands the complete and consistent accomplishment of the tasks of the national, anti-imperialist, democratic revolution, and resists reactionary attempts to check social progress.

The solution of the peasant problem, which directly affects the interests of the vast majority of the population, is of the utmost importance to these countries. Without radical agrarian reforms it is impossible to solve the food problem and sweep away the remnants

of mediævalism which fetter the development of the productive forces in agriculture and industry. The creation and extension on a democratic basis of the state sector in the national economy, particularly in industry — a sector independent from foreign monopolies and gradually becoming a determining factor in the country's economy — is of great importance in these countries.

The alliance of the working class and the peasantry is the most important force in winning and defending national independence, accomplishing far-reaching democratic transformations and ensuring social progress. This alliance forms the basis of a broad national front. The extent to which the national bourgeoisie participates in the liberation struggle also depends to no small degree upon its strength and stability. A big role can be played by the national patriotic forces, by all elements of the nation prepared to fight for national independence, against imperialism.

In present conditions, the national bourgeoisie of the colonial and dependent countries unconnected with imperialist circles, is objectively interested in the accomplishment of the principal tasks of anti-imperialist, anti-feudal revolution, and therefore can participate in the revolutionary struggle against imperialism and feudalism. In that sense it is progressive. But it is unstable; though progressive, it is inclined to compromise with imperialism and feudalism. Owing to its dual nature, the extent to which the national bourgeoisie participates in revolution differs from country to country. This depends on concrete conditions, on changes in the relationship of class forces, on the sharpness of the contradictions between imperialism, feudalism and the people, and of the contradictions between imperialism, feudalism and the national bourgeoisie.

After winning political independence the people seek solutions to the social problems raised by life and to the problems of reinforcing national independence. Different classes and parties offer different solutions. Which course of development to choose is the internal affair of the peoples themselves. As social contradictions grow the national bourgeoisie inclines more and more to compromising with domestic reaction and imperialism. The people, however, begin to see that the best way to abolish age-long backwardness and improve their living standard is that of non-capitalist development. Only thus can the peoples free themselves from exploitation, poverty and hunger. The working class and the broad peasant masses will play the leading part in solving this basic social problem.

In the present situation, favourable domestic and international conditions arise in many countries for the establishment of an independent national democracy, that is, a state which consistently upholds its political and economic independence, fights against imperialism and its military blocs, against military bases on its territory; a state which fights against the new forms of colonialism and the penetration of imperialist capital; a state which rejects dictatorial and despotic methods of government; a state in which the people are ensured broad democratic rights and freedom (freedom of speech, press, assembly, demonstrations, establishment of political parties and social organisations), the opportunity to work for the

enactment of an agrarian reform and other democratic and social changes, and for participation in shaping government policy. The formation and consolidation of national democracies enables the countries concerned to make rapid social progress and play an active part in the peoples' struggle for peace, against the aggressive policies of the imperialist camp, for the complete abolition of colonial oppression.

The Communist Parties are working actively for a consistent completion of the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal, democratic revolution, for the establishment of national democracies, for a radical improvement in the living standard of the people. They support those actions of national governments leading to the consolidation of the gains achieved and undermining the imperialists' positions. At the same time they firmly oppose anti-democratic, anti-popular acts and those measures of the ruling circles which endanger national independence. Communists expose attempts by the reactionary section of the bourgeoisie to represent its selfish, narrow class interests as those of the entire nation. They expose the demagogic use by bourgeois politicians of socialist slogans for the same purpose. They work for a genuine democratisation of social life and rally all the progressive forces to combat despotic regimes or to curb tendencies towards setting up such regimes.

The aims of the communists accord with the supreme interests of the nation. The reactionaries' effort to break up the national front under the slogan of "anti-communism" and isolate the communists, the foremost contingent of the liberation movement, weakens the national movement. It is contrary to the national interests of the people and threatens the loss of national gains.

The socialist countries are true and sincere friends of the peoples fighting for liberation and of those who have thrown off the imperialist yoke. While rejecting on principle any interference in the internal affairs of young national states, they consider it their internationalist duty to help the peoples in strengthening their independence. They help and support these countries generously in achieving progress, creating a national industry, developing and consolidating the national economy and training national personnel. They co-operate with them in the struggle for world peace and against imperialist aggression.

The class-conscious workers of the colonial powers, who realised that "no nation can be free if it oppresses other nations", fought consistently for the self-determination of the nations oppressed by the imperialists. Now that these nations are taking the path of national independence, it is the internationalist duty of the workers and all democratic forces in the industrially developed capitalist countries to assist them vigorously in their struggle against the imperialists. It is their duty to assist them in their struggle for national independence and its consolidation, and in effectively solving the problems of their economic and cultural rebirth. In so doing, the workers defend the interests of the people of their own countries.

The entire course of the world history of recent decades shows the need for the complete and final abolition of the colonial system in all

its forms and manifestations. All the peoples still languishing in colonial bondage must be given every support in winning their national independence. All forms of colonial oppression must be abolished. The abolition of colonialism will also be of great importance in easing international tension and consolidating universal peace. This meeting expresses solidarity with all the peoples of Asia, Africa, Latin America and Oceania who are carrying on a heroic struggle against imperialism. The meeting hails the peoples of the young states of Africa who have achieved political independence—an important step towards complete emancipation. The meeting extends heartfelt greetings and support to the heroic Algerian people fighting for freedom and national independence, and demands an immediate cessation of the aggressive war against Algeria. It indignantly condemns the inhuman system of racial persecution and tyranny in the Union of South Africa (apartheid) and urges democrats throughout the world actively to support the peoples of South Africa in their struggle for freedom and equality. The meeting demands non-interference in the sovereign rights of the peoples of Cuba, the Congo and all the other countries that have won their freedom.

All the socialist countries and the international working-class and communist movement recognise their duty to render the fullest moral and material assistance to the peoples fighting to free themselves from imperialist and colonial tyranny.

The United Nations— Illusions and Reality

By Toussaint

Twelve days after the formal proclamation of the independence of the Republic of the Congo, Premier Lumumba and President Kasavubu made a joint call to the United Nations for the urgent dispatch of military assistance, in order “to protect the national territory of the Congo” against Belgian aggression. It is neither desirable nor possible now to evaluate that action. The battle for the independence of the Congo is still at crisis heat, and the actions

of the United Nations in the area are still the focus of a battle inside the council chambers of the organisation itself. In calmer times, it will be possible for historians to evaluate and judge the full effects of that call for UN intervention, its merits and its consequences. What is now necessary is that the character of the UN itself be analysed and understood in the light of the experience of the Congo, so that the understanding may be put to good use by all the peoples of Africa in their continuing struggles for independence and equality amongst the nations.

Clearly UN General Assembly decisions and UN executive agency actions do not always coincide. On July 14th, two days after the joint Congolese leaders' appeal, the UN Security Council authorised its Secretary General :

"To take the necessary steps, in consultation with the Government of the Republic of the Congo, to provide the Government with such military assistance as may be necessary, until, through the efforts of the Congolese Government with the technical assistance of the UN, the national security forces may be able, in the opinion of the Government to meet fully their tasks". (My emphasis. T.)

It should not be necessary to emphasize how heavily the decision is weighted to make UN assistance an auxiliary to the legitimate government. But the reality is different. The UN forces in the Congo have from the start, operated under separate command as an independent authority, as a rival to the legitimate government, deciding matters of military and political strategy without consultation with the government and often against its wishes. Of this there is too much evidence to permit of doubt.

Seven weeks after the Security Council resolution, America's Dr. Ralph Bunche, UN Under-Secretary for Special Political Affairs, unilaterally recommended that UN forces should not enter the Katanga Province, thus recommending virtual *de facto* recognition of the break-away Tshombe administration's claim to autonomy of Katanga, against the clearly stated policy of the central government. A new Security Council resolution on the matter was needed to override his recommendation. Before this time, the UN Secretary General had been in consultation with Tshombe, while refusing practical consultations with the legitimate government. On July 26th, fourteen days after the Security Council resolution, Deputy Premier Gizenga reported to his government

that UN troops were disarming Congolese national troops, but allowing Belgian troops to keep their arms.

By August 12th, Secretary General Hammarskjöld could bluntly contradict the original Security Council resolution, and state: "The United Nations facilities cannot be used, for example, to transport civilian or military representatives, under the authority of the central government, to Katanga against the decision of the Katanga provincial government . . ." In a reply of bitter protest, Premier Lumumba demanded that the UN honour its resolution by instructing UN forces to hand over control of all Congo airfields to units of the Congolese National Army or police; by making UN military aircraft available to the government for the transport of Congolese troops; by disarming those elements in Katanga who had been armed by the Belgian authorities after the Declaration of Independence, and placing their arms at the disposal of the government. On the following day, Premier Lumumba stated bluntly: "The government of the people of the Congo have lost their confidence in the Secretary General of the United Nations".

The complaint was well founded. As the senior executive officer of UN, the Secretary General is responsible for the UN's actions. The UN force in the Congo has *not* provided the government with such assistance as the government deemed necessary; it has *not* enabled the national security forces to meet their task fully. It has in fact presided over the dismemberment of the centralised Congolese state, and acted as midwife of its fragmentation into a series of puppet states. It has lent its benevolent indifference to the destruction of parliamentary government, and to the usurpation of power by a military dictator. As a direct consequence, the main national contingents serving under the UN Command in the Congo have been withdrawn by their own governments, which voted *for* the original Security Council resolution, but are no longer willing to accept or countenance the deeds of the UN executive agencies in the Congo.

EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATURE

The problem of the relationship between legislature and executive in the modern state is not new. In Europe, for example, the socialist and labour parties have repeatedly been faced with—and generally have failed to solve—the dilemma. How does a

socialist government with a Parliamentary majority introduce socialist policy, while relying heavily on an administrative apparatus built by the capitalist class to suit its own needs and interests, drawn from the ranks of their political supporters, raised in their ideology?

"Expropriation and billeting of houses takes place by order even of the present state", writes Lenin (*State and Revolution*) in a comment on this question. "From the formal point of view, the proletarian state will also 'order' the occupation of houses and the expropriation of buildings. But it is clear that the old executive apparatus, the bureaucracy, which is connected with the bourgeoisie, would simply be unfit to carry out the orders of the proletarian state".

The conclusions which Lenin drew have not, unfortunately, been drawn by the socialist parties of the West, who have accordingly attempted to "take over" the old civil service of the capitalist class, and have found themselves often the prisoners, not the masters, of their executive agencies.

An even more pointed experience has been undergone by several governments of national liberation in former colonial countries, which have attempted to leave the old civil-service of imperialism intact, and to make themselves master of it. In a recent example of this kind, Premier Mossadeq in Iran "took over" the strongest branch of the imperialist executive, the army high command, and attempted to use it as an effective instrument of Iranian national government. At the critical moment of Iran's struggle with foreign oil imperialism, the army high command proved itself faithful not to the government but to imperialism, and lent its weight to imperialism in overthrowing the Mossadeq government and nullifying the oil nationalisation plan. It is this experience, not racialism, which inspires many newly liberated African states to embark on a systematic programme of "Africanisation" of their civil service, which remain the willing accomplice and servant of the imperialists who built it until this process of Africanisation has been carried through.

In the UN, the problem arises differently. The division in this world forum is not the simple class division which is encountered in state parliaments. In UN, the division of interests appears in the first place as divisions between groupings of states. But even here, the division is not so much on geographical lines, as on political lines, reflecting the different class structures of the states,

and the different class character of their rulers. While the UN General Assembly then reflects the relations of power between the various class and political groupings of states, its executive organs nevertheless present the same problem as that presented by the civil service of a single country.

At the recent session of the UN, Mr. Khrushchov highlighted the problem with his demand for a revision of the position of the Secretary General, who is the UN's senior executive official.

"It is necessary" he said, "that the executive agency of UN should reflect the actual situation now existing in the world. The UN includes member states of the military blocs of the Western powers. Socialist states and neutralist countries . . . We consider it wise and fair that UN's executive agency should appear not as one person — the Secretary General — but should consist of three persons . . . representatives of the states belonging to the three basic groupings".

Rounding off a strong attack on the UN Secretary General's deviation from his instructions in regard to policy in the Congo, Mr. Khrushchov declared that such a three-man secretariat would provide the "pre-requisite for the correct carrying out of decisions taken". He concluded that it would also "provide a definite guarantee against the activity of the UN executive agency being detrimental to one of these groups of states".

FORUM OR PARLIAMENT

In some circles there is a tendency to think of UN as a "world parliament", or as some type of supra-national state. Clearly this is not Mr. Khrushchov's view.

"The existence of the United Nations" Mr. Khrushchov told the General Assembly, "would become meaningless if it became a one-sided organisation, declining to the position of lackey to one military bloc or another". In this is expressed the view that UN is not a 'world parliament' or a supra-national state, but a forum, in which the international disputes and rivalries between nations or groups of nations can be reconciled and resolved in peace.

Despite UN, rivalries and differences of policy reflecting differing class interests continue to exist in world affairs. UN cannot fail to reflect these rivalries. It is necessary, however, that the position both in the UN "legislative" bodies and in its executive organs correspond to the real power relations of the world outside; for if it does not, it can only mean that UN is

becoming the tool of one power bloc against the others. That this is the situation developing with the Secretary-General's post is now becoming clear. But the same position exists throughout the UN officialdom and its specialised agencies, and also within the legislative organs of UN itself. The case of the Security Council is most glaring.

The Security Council is the UN's most important permanent organ; it bears the main responsibility for the maintenance of world peace. Since it is clear that world peace cannot be maintained where one of the major military powers is determined otherwise, the Charter provides that the five permanent members of the Security Council must be unanimous on all major decisions. At the time this provision was written into the Charter, the 'Big Five' were the U.S.A., U.S.S.R., Britain, China and France.

Today, largely through consistent Anglo-American insistence, China is not represented, its place being taken by the small — and internationally insignificant — Chiang Kai Shek regime of Taiwan. The purpose of the exclusion of China is apparent. Taiwan is a willing lackey of the U.S.A. Its continuation as a permanent member of the Security Council, with the right of veto, goes a long way towards turning the Security Council itself into a lackey of the Anglo-American military bloc.

The same purpose is evident in the election of the non-permanent members of the Security Council. Here, by 'gentleman's agreement' reached in 1946, non-permanent seats were to be allocated on a geographic basis — two to Latin America, and one each to Western Europe, Eastern Europe, the Middle East and the British Commonwealth. The agreement has been generally maintained except in the case of Eastern Europe — again be it noted, the one area thus allocated which is not firmly within the orbit of the Anglo-American military bloc. Thus, until the election of Poland in 1960, Eastern Europe has been unrepresented since 1949. Yugoslavia, conducting a running battle with the overwhelmingly socialist Eastern Europe has held the seat for three years, Greece for two. Turkey (!) — which in other years held the Middle East seat, also held the 'East European' seat for two years, as did Japan, and as did the Philippines for one year.

THE WORLD BALANCE

It should be noted here that the division of seats, even if the 'gentleman's agreement' were adhered to, would not reflect

accurately the composition of the UN membership today. Since 1946, the sweep of colonial liberation has transformed Africa and Asia. Thirteen new African states have been admitted to UN in 1960 alone, bringing the number of African members to 22 out of a total of 98. Yet Africa and Asia remain virtually unrepresented, save for Taiwan, those areas of Africa which fall into the 'Middle East', and those member states of the British Commonwealth. Perhaps at the time of its formation UN correctly reflected the balance of power and influence amongst its 52 members. It no longer does so today. The socialist camp has grown in numbers, and in military and political and economic importance. The former colonial countries have, in large number, achieved nationhood and independence. And the camp of imperialism has, accordingly, shrunk and declined. But UN composition has ossified. It is this fact that gave rise to Mr. Kwame Nkrumah's demand at the recent General Assembly session for a permanent seat on the Security Council to be allocated to Africa, and to the Nigerian representative's demand for "effective representation" of Africa on the Council.

In the next most important permanent organ of UN, the Trusteeship Council, the position is much the same. Here too the camp of western imperialism hangs on grimly, refusing to bring the composition of the Council into line with the real world balance of power. The Council — theoretically consists of the Big Five, of those powers administering trust territories, and of sufficient elected members to equalise the numbers of the administering and the non-administering states. In fact, the numbers of those 'administering' has been swollen by both France and Italy — both members of the NATO military alliance — who once administered trust territories but no longer do so. Here again, China is absent and Taiwan present. And amongst the elected members there is only one African state, the United Arab Republic, and two Asian states, India and Burma. These facts serve to explain Mr. Khrushchov's criticism of the Trusteeship Council at UN.

"The present trusteeship system . . . was, according to the United Nations Charter, to promote the development of the trust territories towards self-government and independence. Fifteen years have passed however, since the Charter was adopted, but only four trust territories out of eleven have

attained independence. To this date (23.9.60) no definite dates have been established for the granting of independence to the trust territories, including the biggest of such territories — Tanganyika, Ruanda-Urundi and New Guinea . . . The trusteeship powers in fact maintain a colonial regime, ruthlessly exploiting the population, plundering their natural resources . . . Nowhere has the trusteeship system justified itself, and it must be buried together with the entire colonial system — which has outlived itself”.

The position of the UN's financial agencies is even worse, reflecting the total American domination of world finance in the immediate post-war period, before the socialist countries had repaired the ravages of war. The parent body, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) has 68 member states, but is fully controlled by U.S. capital. Voting rights are directly proportional to the capital subscribed. The International Monetary Fund is similarly patterned, and equally U.S. controlled. The International Finance Corporation (IFC), formed in 1956 to promote the export of private capital to 'under-developed' countries, and to develop private enterprise on an international scale, is directed by IBRD, and the two bodies have a common executive. The latest comer in the field, the International Development Association (IDA) was formed in 1959, with the aim of extending financial assistance to under-developed countries on terms more favourable than those of IBRD and its associates. Its very formation reveals the fact that all three of the financial agencies had proved unsatisfactory and unacceptable to the 'under-developed' states. Only members of IBRD may be members of the International Development Association. Its organisational structure is much the same as that of the IBRD, and voting rights will be directly proportional to capital subscribed. Of the initial \$1,000 million capital, \$320.3 million will be taken up by the U.S.A.

UN'S "CIVIL SERVICE"

The same heavy weighting in favour of the imperialist military blocs is runs through the whole of the UN permanent staff. A recent study by a Soviet periodical, Political Affairs, leads to the conclusion that “the overwhelming majority of (UN) employees are citizens of the U.S.A. or of states allied to it in aggressive blocs”. It should be noted in this regard that the majority of UN

employees on an executive level are appointed for an indefinite period; 83.4% of the specialist employees are thus on "life contracts". As a result, says Political Affairs, "... the channel for the intake of fresh, new recruits is narrowed, and the Secretariat becomes a sort of caste, to which admittance is, to all intents and purposes closed". Thus more than half the officials on the Secretariat are drawn from the fourteen member states of NATO. Of the Secretariat officials, 356 are citizens of the U.S.A., 132 of Britain, 90 of France, 52 of Taiwan and only 34 of the U.S.S.R. Of the leading group of officials, who hold ranks of deputy to the Secretary General and similar high-ranking posts, seventeen out of twenty-eight are from countries of the Western bloc, one from the U.S.S.R. Of the 1620 staff members in UN's specialised agencies, only 63 (i.e. 4%) are Soviet citizens, though the U.S.S.R. contributes 16% of UN's budget.

No figures are available on the numbers of such personnel drawn from former colonial territories, from Africa or from Asia. Their numbers must be minute. Here too the division of responsibility for executive decision clearly fails to reflect the real world situation, but reflects instead the heavy predominance of the Anglo-American imperialist bloc, which was the main feature of the immediate post-war world situation, but is no longer its main feature today. It is only in the light of these facts that the total picture of UN action in world affairs becomes comprehensible. UN is not, as some idealists would picture it, a kind of world Parliament, where considerations of national and class self-interest are mysteriously abolished, and where the pursuit of 'pure reason' and 'progress' are the only motivating factors. It is rather a forum at which, and through which, international rivalries show themselves on a new plane.

KOREA, EGYPT, CONGO

The nature of the shift in the world forces represented at UNO are clearly revealed by its role and actions in the three major military incidents in which it has participated — Korea, Egypt and the Congo. In Korea, the earliest of the three, UN action took place at a time when the newer socialist countries were not yet at a high level of military and economic achievement, when the world peace movement was not yet at the full peak of its strength, when the colonial revolutions had not yet swept victorious over Africa

and Asia. Accordingly, in Korea, UN action served as a shield for blatant American aggression, in a twin-edged effort to test out new weapons and to prepare a springboard for attack on the socialist camp. Though the decision to launch American intervention under the UN colours reflected in part the American domination of the organisation, it did not however reflect accurately the real balance of military power in the world — for China was then, as now, outside the United Nations; nor did it reflect accurately the balance of political power even in UN itself — for the Security Council agreement to American intervention was made possible by an “accidental” factor, the absence of the Soviet delegate from the vital debate, as a protest against the exclusion of China. As a result, the UN action ended in disaster for the American dominated bloc, in military stalemate and finally in unwilling armistice.

By the time of the Anglo-French invasion of Egypt, the world peace movement had grown in strength; the Soviet Union had recovered from the ravages of World War II; the peoples of Asia had largely completed their struggles for national independence, and emerged as a power on the world scene. These facts changed both the character of the world scene, and the character of the UN General Assembly. But in addition, a further factor came into play, the rivalry between America herself and her Anglo-French allies for dominance and prestige in the colonial world, and especially in Africa. Here UN neither backed imperialist aggression, nor stood aloofly ‘above the struggle’. The overwhelming alliance of world force against the Anglo-French imperial grab made UN an effective instrument for peace — though not without strong criticism from both Egypt and the U.S.S.R. (who refused to pay a share of the UN costs incurred in clearing the Suez Canal, insisting that this obligation fell on the shoulders of the aggressors alone).

The Congo situation needs no further description. Here the decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council accurately reflect world opinion; the executive agencies nevertheless pursue other policies, policies favouring the national interests of the U.S.A. and the imperialist bloc generally, and the UN itself fails to call them to book. This failure has been a bitter awakening

to many people in Africa, who have come to think of the 'African bloc' as a force which already radically transforms the world scene, and makes of UN a lofty, god-like expression of international conscience working undeviatingly for peace.

THE AFRICAN BLOC

Independent Africa is united in its desire for national independence, but not in its relations to international problems, or even on the key questions for Africa's future which come before the United Nations. Let us look first at Africa's record on the main question of the UN's future, the admission of Peoples' China to UN and to one of the Big Five seats on the Security Council. In 1958, a resolution sponsored by India, Afghanistan, Burma, Ceylon, Indonesia, Nepal and the United Arab Republic — the 'Afro-Asian' bloc — to consider China's admission was defeated by 44 votes to 28. Liberia voted with the Union of South Africa against. Ethiopia, Libya and Tunisia abstained. Only Ghana, Guinea, the U.A.R., Sudan and Morocco voted for. In 1960, a similar vote was also defeated by 42 votes to 34. Again Liberia voted against. Ethiopia, a former abstainer, voted for. Of the new African states, Mali, Senegal and Nigeria voted for. But twelve African states — the vital twelve votes which could have turned the tide — abstained.

An even more revealing division was on the question of whether Kasavubu should be seated as representative of the Republic of the Congo. At the time of the vote, Kasavubu had clearly aligned himself with the self-appointed military dictator Mobutu; the elected Premier, Patrice Lumumba was under virtual arrest, and Parliament had been declared 'dissolved' by Mobutu. Kasavubu was finally seated in UN 50 votes to 32, with fourteen abstentions. Two of the abstentions were Libya and Tunisia; Nigeria absented itself, and thus avoided committing itself. Ghana, Guinea, Mali and the U.A.R. voted against seating Kasavubu. All the African members of the 'French Community' voted for.

Thus Africa — liberated Africa — divides on questions of vital policy. The divisions are carried further outside the UN debating chambers. At Abidjan in October, the 12 French Community states met and decided to back Kasavubu at UN; they decided further to seek "a cease fire (in Algeria) on terms that respect the personality of the Algerian resistance movement". This is a long way from

recognition of the demands of the Algerian people themselves for the right of self-determination. At the other end of the scale comes President Nkrumah's call for the formation of an African military command, to operate under the United Nations, and thus to prevent the UN forces becoming an instrument of imperialist policy against African liberation as they have in the Congo. To discuss his plan, he has called Liberia, Guinea, Morocco, Tunisia, Libya, the U.A.R., Ethiopia, Sudan and Mali; but none of the French Community states have been invited.

DIVISION AND UNITY

The divisions in Africa, like the divisions elsewhere, have a class basis. Not all African states have advanced the same distance along the road to economic independence; not all have, to the same extent, shaken off the political and economic influences of colonialism. Those who have travelled furthest challenge imperialism in the international field directly. Others compromise with it, or support it. Thus the former French colony of Guinea which fought for its independence and won it in the face of bitter French opposition, stands uncompromisingly against imperialism, for peace and the right of nations to self determination. The other French colonies, whose independence comes by an arrangement with French imperialism which leaves strong neo-colonialist influences and interests behind, stand at the other end of the scale, supporting the aims of imperialism inside and outside of UN.

This is naturally also a shifting phenomenon. The struggle for real economic liberation from imperialism is not completed, even in the independent states of Africa. It is still in its infancy in many areas. Each new victory recorded in that struggle will serve to strengthen the solid front of anti-imperialism in Africa, and thus to enable Africa finally to emerge as a bloc, united in policy and outlook on all major international questions.

Nor is the alignment of power in UN permanent. Every shift in the struggle for national independence in the world, every move towards socialism serves to strengthen the forces of world peace against the imperialist military bloc, and thus to make UN conform more closely to the ideals which are set down in the Charter. But already the shift in world balance of power since UN's formation is such as to make radical revision of many aspects of the UN Charter necessary and urgent, if UN is to fulfil its role as a forum for the world settlement of international disputes through peace.

South West Africa: Test Case for UNO and Africa

By B. Radebe

South West Africa, like the Congo, is a test case on the African continent for the United Nations.

The story of South West is of a tortured people held in subjection by the South African police state of terror and *apartheid*; of a former mandate of the League of Nations that should today, under the United Nations Trusteeship system, be on the threshold to full independence, but instead was stolen by the Union of South Africa, and forcibly incorporated in defiance of all international rule and 14 years' successive condemnation by the world body.

THE PEOPLES AND HISTORY OF SOUTH WEST

The territory of South West Africa is about 320,000 square miles in extent, or about three-quarters of the size of its expropriator, the Union of South Africa.

Its peoples are White (about 70,000, mostly farmers); and Non-Whites. Among the latter are the Bushmen, the oldest inhabitants, who live by hunting and fruit and root gathering, much as they did thousands of years ago and who today number perhaps 10,000; the 30,000 Namas or Hottenots; and the Bantu speaking peoples. These comprise the Hereros (about 30,000 today); the Damaras (also about 30,000) the Ovambos (about 200,000) and the Okavangos (about 30,000). Finally there are in South West the Rehebothers, a community of mixed origin, partly White, partly African, partly Nama, who number about 10,000 in all.

Little is known of the early history of the peoples of South West. There were occasional conflicts between the various tribes, but these are exceptions to the general picture, which is one of prosperous communities with plenty of land and large herds of cattle. The British Commissioner in South Africa, Palgrave, wrote to his government in 1876: "It is impossible to estimate the Damaras' (Hereros') wealth although there is evidence enough to indicate that it is considerable. The poorest families in a tribe possess something, three or four cows, a few oxen, 20 or 30 sheep". Palgrave mentioned that one under-chief possessed over 10,000

head of cattle, while the Herero chief Kambazeni was reported to have possessed 25,000 head of cattle at the time of his death in 1903. When the territory was annexed by Germany in 1890, "the Herero people must have possessed well over 150,000 head of cattle".

By the end of the German occupation of South West, the Hereros had lost all their land and cattle, and their own numbers had been reduced from 80,000 to 15,000.

THE COLONISERS

The first White man to come to South West Africa was Diego Cam, who made a landing at Cape Cross in 1486 and set up a cross there. But for nearly 300 years thereafter the South West African coast remained off the beaten track until in the 19th century ships began to put into Walvis Bay regularly to obtain fresh meat from the Namas. During the 18th and 19th centuries, more and more White men began to visit the territory — hunters, explorers, traders and missionaries. Mission and trading stations were set up, and gradually little pockets of white settlement began to grow.

The Whites began to agitate for "protection" against the Blacks who surrounded them in overwhelming numbers. The Cape Parliament passed a resolution in favour of the extension of the boundaries of the Cape to include Walvis Bay and as much of the interior as necessary, and Palgrave was sent to conclude treaties with a number of tribes as a preliminary to the annexation of their territory. But the British Government were reluctant to undertake heavy new commitments, and in 1878 were only prepared to take formal possession of Walvis Bay and a surrounding area of some 400 miles. The rest remained no-man's-land.

It was the Germans following in the wake of their traders and Rhenish missionaries, who stepped into the breach. They annexed South West Africa, outside of the British enclave of Walvis Bay, in terms of the Berlin Conference settlement of 1885 which carved up the African continent among the imperialist powers of Europe.

With typical imperialist hypocrisy, the Berlin Conference powers "emphatically pledged themselves and placed on record their recognition of the sacred duty:

Of preserving the aboriginal races of Africa;

Of watching over their interest;

Of cultivating their moral and material advancement and development".

CONQUEST and GENOCIDE

Twelve years later, a British Blue Book on "The Native Tribes of South West Africa and their Treatment by Germany" reported, "the surviving Hereros did not possess an ox, a heifer, or a calf between them".

Ignoring the pledge they had taken at the Berlin conference, the Germans set about subjugating the indigenous tribes of South West Africa. They started by storming the stronghold of the Nama leader, Hendrik Witbooi, and though they succeeded in defeating him, they were faced thereafter with a series of risings amongst the other tribes, leading to protracted guerilla warfare. In 1902 the Bondelswarts, a section of the Nama tribe, rebelled, followed in 1903 by the Hereros, who provided the Germans with the toughest opposition they had yet encountered in their colonial territories.

The war was fought with great savagery on both sides. But the Herero chief, Samuel Maharero, at least issued an order "for all my people that they shall not lay hands on the following, namely, Englishmen, Boers, Bastards, Bergdamaras, Namas". And even the German Governor afterwards stated: "It seems to have been the definite intention of the Herero leaders to protect all women and children". The German commander General von Trotha was restrained by no such scruples and issued an order that "every Herero with or without a rifle, with or without cattle, will be shot". Scenes of indescribable carnage were witnessed as the Herero nation were driven into the desert. A German soldier wrote of one incident where a party of Hereros had been surrounded: "We led the men away to one side and shot them. The women and children, who looked pitiably starved, we hunted into the bush". Thousands died as the Hereros tried to cross the desert, hoping for sanctuary in British Bechuanaland. Some, after terrible hardships, succeeded, and to this day there is a section of the Herero people living in Bechuanaland under their Paramount Chief Frederick Maharero.

The scandal of the Herero war raised an outcry in Europe, and German policy in South West Africa was drastically revised by von Trotha's successor, von Lindequist, who proclaimed a general amnesty. But the damage was done. The Herero power was broken. Of that once great nation, only 15,000 starving fugitives remained. Their way of life was gone for ever and they were forced to seek a livelihood in the service of the White man.

The Germans never succeeded in pacifying South West Africa. The Nama revolt continued sporadically, and unrest among the other tribes was stimulated by an order prohibiting all the indigenous people of South West Africa from owning cattle. The nightmare of German rule was brought to an end by the outbreak of the First World War, and by the Treaty of Versailles Germany was deprived of all her overseas possessions.

THE MANDATE

In terms of article 119 of the Treaty of Versailles, the Germans ceded South West Africa to the Allies, who in turn entrusted the territory to the King of England, to be administered on his behalf by the Government of the Union of South Africa as a Class C Mandate. This settlement was approved by the Council of the League of Nations in 1920. Class C Mandates were to be "administered under the Mandatory as integral portions of its territory, *subject to the principle that the well-being and development of the indigenous peoples form a sacred trust of civilisation*". Article 2 of the Mandate for South West Africa added: "*The Mandatory shall promote to the utmost the material and moral well-being and the social progress of the inhabitants of the Territory, subject to the present Mandate*". Article 3 prohibited the slave trade. Article 6 obliged the Mandatory to submit annual reports to the League of Nations, "to the satisfaction of the Council, containing full information with regard to the territory". Article 7 stated that "*the consent of the League of Nations is required for any modifications of the terms of the present Mandate*", and stipulated that any dispute over the Mandate should be submitted to the Permanent Court of International Justice provided for by Article 14 of the Covenant of the League of Nations.

Once again obligations towards the indigenous peoples of South West Africa were solemnly undertaken by an imperialist power which had no intentions of carrying them out. Far from promoting "to the utmost" the material and moral well-being and the social progress of the inhabitants of the territory", the policies which have been carried out in the territory by successive South African Governments for the last 40 years have retarded the development of the indigenous peoples.

Right from the start, their land was taken away and the tribes were confined to reservations on the Union pattern. The pattern of apartheid in the political, social and economic spheres of the

Union of South Africa, exists also in South West Africa; but the gap between the living standards of Black and White is even greater and the all-round development of the indigenous peoples is even lower than in the Union.

LAND HOLDINGS

The right of free access to the land is fundamental to the development of any community under capitalism. In South West Africa this right does not exist. In a memorandum to the Prime Minister of the Union, Dr. D. F. Malan, on the occasion of his visit to South West Africa in 1948, the tribes pointed out that "the African people, whether in South West Africa or in the Union of South Africa, have no absolute land rights: rights, that is to say, which cannot be abrogated by a European Parliament at will".

When the Union forces in the 1914-15 campaign against the Germans sought the assistance of the African tribes, Lord Buxton, then governor of the Cape, promised them that they would get their lands back if the Germans were defeated. This promise, too, was not kept, and in its report to the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1948 the Trusteeship Council expressed "its apprehension that . . . the Union Government has not seen fit to restore the traditional land rights which were taken away from the indigenous inhabitants under the German regime".

Proclaimed African reserves in South West Africa total 18,630,597 hectares, to which may be added the 1,244,400 hectares of the Rehoboth Gebiet—a total of approximately 20 million hectares. By contrast, the area of land available for White farming totals almost 40 million hectares. *Thus the 70,000-strong White community have twice as much land at their disposal as the 400,000 Non-White—and the Whites have absolute title to the land, whereas the non-Whites do not.* The consequences of this policy of land theft have been that the tribes have been broken up and the indigenous peoples forced to become the hewers of wood and drawers of water for the privileged White community.

Not surprisingly, this land policy led to great unrest among the indigenous peoples, and from time to time outbreaks of violence have taken place. In 1922 the Bondelswarts uprising took place as a result of a dispute over boundaries and a dog tax of £1 a dog. On the instructions of General Smuts, the rising was put down by South African military planes dropping bombs on the defenceless Bondelswarts from the air.

This was 21 years before Mussolini outraged the world by dropping mustard gas on the Abyssinians. Truly the frightfulness of imperialism knows no national barriers.

U.N. REPORT

Just how little the Mandatory power has done to promote "to the utmost" the material and moral well-being and the social progress of the inhabitants of the territory was brought out by the Report of the U.N. Trusteeship Council covering its second and third sessions in 1947 and 1948. The report, based on official information submitted by the South African Government, noted that

- x the indigenous inhabitants have no franchise, no eligibility to office and no representation in the governing bodies or administration of the territory;

- x there is an expenditure of little more than 10 per cent. of the budget on the indigenous inhabitants, who comprise approximately 85 per cent. of the population;

- x the large number of criminal convictions reveals an abnormal situation; and the Council was of the opinion that contractual relations between employer and labourer should not be subject to criminal penalties;

- x educational facilities for the indigenous peoples were hopelessly inadequate;

- x land available to the indigenous peoples was hopelessly inadequate;

- x the splitting up of the tribes and their confinement to reservations "is to be deplored in principle".

POVERTY AND IGNORANCE

It is in the sphere of education that the shortcomings of the Mandatory power are most glaringly exposed. In 1955 there were 9,934 white scholars in government schools in the Police Zone (that is the portion of South West Africa where both whites and Non-Whites live together — excluding the bigger reservations in the north). Each White pupil cost the Administration £46. But there were only 7,413 African scholars, each costing only £12. In the Reserves there were a further 18,867 African scholars, but the level of the education provided for them and the length of their stay in school can be estimated from the fact that they cost the Administration only £1 8s. 5d. each.

There is not one high school in Windhoek for the population

of some 18,000 Non-Whites, and only one for Africans in the whole territory, at the Rhenish mission training school at Okahandja which last year opened a matriculation class for the first time.

It is estimated that the whole territory of South West Africa has produced only one Non-White doctor, and the total number of university trained Non-Whites can almost be counted on the fingers of one hand. This is the "utmost" the Mandatory has been able to achieve in 40 years!

The facts of the economic life of the people are more difficult to come by, but reveal clearly that the Mandatory power has succeeded in promoting to the utmost only the material and moral well-being of the Whites, at the expense of all sections of the Non-White population.

x In 1955-56, out of a total Budget expenditure of £10,720,000, only £404,741 represented direct expenditure on Africans, including education, "Native Affairs", public health and the Territorial Development and Reserve Fund.

x In 1950, the number of cattle and calves owned by Whites totalled 1,293,304; the comparable figure for Africans was 315,695. The Whites had 3,616,935 sheep of all types, including Karakul sheep and lambs, one of the greatest economic assets of the territory; the Africans had only 78,541. The Whites had 855,581 goats and kids, the Africans 525,831. The Whites 18,280 pigs; the Africans 1,587 pigs.

x Per capita income of White and Black residents in the Police Zone in 1956 was £176 a year. Per capita income for those living outside the Police Zone was only £8 10s. a year — and that includes income from employment as well as subsistence income. Since the bulk of the Whites live in the Police Zone, whereas it is mainly Africans who live outside the Police Zone (apart from a handful of White officials), this gives some indication of the startling gap between White and Black income levels in South West Africa.

The average income per head of population in South West Africa is the second highest of all the territories of Africa, the highest being the Union. A bourgeois economist comments: "The overall averages are highest in those territories where the mineral industry is well developed and where the European population is large enough for the characteristically high European averages to

have a significant effect on the national average".

In plain language, Black labour is terribly exploited in South West Africa, to the great benefit of the Whites of the territory, as well as investors living abroad.

THE WORKING PEOPLE

In 1956, the mining industry contributed £31 million to the national income of South West Africa, as compared with the £16,500,000 of agriculture and fishing. Gross national income was £72.3 million. The producers of this wealth, the contract labourers who work on the mines and farms, get only 1s. 3d. a day, plus rations and accommodation — but what that "accommodation" amounts to can perhaps be judged by the remarks of the South West Africa Native Labourers Commission (1945-48):

"The main burden of complaint against bad housing conditions was directed at housing, or — more correctly stated — the absence of housing on farms . . . Unfortunately, there are still farmers whose attitude towards native housing is that the natives in their natural state are accustomed to living under a bush, and that accordingly they are not entitled to anything better from their employers".

BAD CONDITIONS :

On the mines the notorious compound system obtains.

The bulk of the labourers on the mines and farms are recruited from Ovamboland by the South West Africa Native Labour Association. A statement issued by Mr. Sam Nujoma, President of the Ovamboland People's Organisation, in December 1959 declared that "when recruited the contracted Ovambos are not free to choose the employer for whom they are going to work and the type of work they are going to do. They do not even know the wages they are going to get.

"As soon as they arrive at Grootfontein they are placed in a camp and are sold to white employers like animals. Those who are bound for the south are transported in dark cattle trucks. They are supplied with one shirt, one pair of khaki shorts and one blanket . . .

"SWANLA exploits the contracted Ovambos in an inhuman way. It does not always provide transport so as to enable the people to reach their destination. Some Ovambos have to walk long

distances to their employers. Some of them have to wait long periods for their employers to fetch them.

"They are usually half starved, their ration being 6d. bread per day. They are not supplied with tea or coffee. At many railway stations there are no waiting rooms and the contracted Ovambos have to sleep in the open air even when it is raining or in bad weather. This inhuman treatment must be terminated without delay".

HIGH PROFITS

In the post-war period, the striking profit returns made possible by Southern Africa's apartheid set-up have attracted a deal of American investment. The Newmont Mining Corporation and the American Metal Co. in 1945 jointly acquired 57 per cent. control of the O'Okiep Copper Co. in South Africa. In 1947 they took over the lead, zinc, copper mining complex at Tsumeb in South West Africa, which the Germans before them had stolen from the Hereros (Newmont 56.3 per cent., American metal 19.7 per cent.). Several thousand Africans work for a pittance in the Tsumeb mines, which returned 8 million dollars net earnings in the first three years of operation — 1 million dollars in excess of the initial capital outlay. In the four years 1952-55 the net profits (after tax) of O'Okiep and Tsumeb together amounted to 74.7 million dollars; 26.4 million dollars of this went to Newmont in dividend payments and 14.5 million dollars to American Metal.

Bethlehem Steel in 1954 completed a two-year mineral survey in the Kaokoveld, South West Africa, and was reported to have found immense iron ore deposits which, however, require hundreds of miles of railway construction before they can become a profitable proposition. The U.S. Steel Corporation has contracts to buy yearly between 30 and 50,000 tons of manganese ore mined in South West Africa by the South African Minerals Corporation.

In 1959 it was reported that an American oil company had acquired prospecting rights over Diamond Area No. 2 in South West Africa and conducted a magneto-metric aerial survey costing £60,000 which showed that oil might be present in the vicinity of Tsondabvlei. In August 1960 it was announced that the Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation was to start drilling for oil in the area soon.

The U.S. Rio Tinto Corporation is also reported to have shown interest in copper deposits near Okahandja.

The grip of foreign capitalism on South West Africa's natural

resources is by no means negligible. Nearly 95 per cent. of South West Africa's post-war mining output was accounted for by only three foreign companies. The amount of investment income originating in mining and flowing abroad in 1956 was estimated at £27 million, compared with a net outflow for the economy as a whole of £30.2 million.

SOUTH WEST AFRICA AND UNO

There can be no doubt whatsoever that the powerful American investment in South West Africa has been one of the factors preventing a settlement of the problem in relation to the United Nations since 1945.

The factors about this dispute are well-known and need only be briefly re-stated here. On the dissolution of the League of Nations, all the other mandatory powers voluntarily converted their commissions into trusteeships under the United Nations. The Union refused to do this. Under a fraudulent referendum held by the Smuts Government, the tribes of South West were alleged to have agreed to become part of the Union of South Africa, but by resolution of December 14, 1946 the General Assembly recommended that the Territory be placed under the international trusteeship system, and invited the South African Government to submit a trusteeship agreement for the territory. This the Union has consistently refused to do, and Union encroachment on South West Africa has advanced steadily. Since 1951 South West has been represented in the Union Parliament by six members of the House of Assembly and four Senators. (These elections are confined to White voters only). Since 1949 the Union has refused even to submit annual reports on the territory, as required by the mandate, and that year UNO referred the matter to the International Court of Justice for an advisory opinion. The Court held that :

x South West Africa is still under the League of Nations Mandate assumed by South Africa after the first World War.

x The provisions of the U.N. Charter provide a means by which South West Africa may be brought under the trusteeship system.

x South Africa is not competent to modify the international status of the territory. This can be done only with United Nations consent.

x South Africa has an obligation to submit reports and transmit petitions from the inhabitants to the United Nations.

x South Africa is not legally obliged to place the country under the trusteeship system.

The court was unanimous on the first three points, but divided on the others. The fourth was carried by 12 votes to two, and the fifth by eight votes to six.

Endless negotiations, petitions and resolutions since then have failed to resolve the deadlock. In 1953 the General Assembly appointed a Committee on South West Africa and required it to negotiate with the Union and report on conditions in the territory. Each year the report of this committee became more critical, but each year the Union became more intransigent. In 1958 a Good Offices Committee consisting of representatives of Brazil, the United Kingdom and the United States, was appointed to discuss with the Union "a basis for an agreement which would continue to accord to the territory of South West Africa an international status". In its first report the committee tentatively suggested the partition of the territory as a possible solution, but this was categorically rejected by the U.N. Assembly. Eventually the Committee announced that it had failed to find a basis of agreement.

The end — 1960 session of the United Nations condemned South Africa's maladministration of South West more strongly than ever; and this crisis area in Africa will again be on UNO's agenda early in 1961, and is being taken to the International Court of Justice in an attempt, initiated by Ethiopia and Liberia, to have compulsory jurisdiction on the question of South Africa's theft of the territory.

THE UNITED NATIONS MUST ACT

How is it possible that the Union has been able to defy world opinion with impunity for 15 years, ever since the United Nations was formed? How much longer, the people of South West Africa are demanding, will it be before UNO and the world are forced to intervene, and, in the name of justice and humanity, set matters right?

UNO's own crisis of paralysis on the issue of South West springs from the contradictory position that while the world body has outspokenly condemned South Africa's treatment of South West, some of the most powerful states in UNO are co-partners in the exploitation of the stolen mandate. Only during the 1959 session did the United States of America for the first time abandon

her defence of Union policy. Imperialist investors in the mines and wealth of South West Africa are far more concerned with protecting their profits than the people of the country, and during the last fourteen years it is the backpedalling by the United States and Britain that has blocked decisive pressure by the United Nations on the South West African issue.

The battle to do justice to the peoples of South West Africa is thus the battle to bring peace and real freedom to the Congo; the battle to mould the United Nations into the international body which really enforces the will of the majority of the freedom-striving peoples of the world.

The peoples of South West Africa will go on fighting to seek effective redress with the aid of the United Nations, and to build up international pressure against South Africa to the point where it becomes irresistible and South Africa is forced to give way. With ever-growing African participation in the world body the day is approaching when it will be possible to put pressure on South Africa to restore South West to its rightful heritage. Fewer and fewer countries are prepared to act openly in defence of South African interests.

DECISIVE BATTLES

But the solution of the problem of South West Africa will not come only from abroad, for the decisive battles have to be fought out by the peoples of Southern Africa itself.

The outside world will act decisively when the peoples of South West Africa and the Union force the issue.

The organisations of the people in South West and in the Union will spearhead change.

Until recently there were no national organisations of any sort operative among the peoples of South West Africa. Two have made an appearance in the last two years — the South West Africa National Union and the Ovamboland Peoples' Organisation. These are not rival organisations. SWANU'S territory covers the whole country, and its aims is to unite the members of all national groups in the fight for independence and democracy. O.P.O., on the other hand, has a more restricted scope and is concerned mainly with the problems of the migratory Ovambo workers. The two organisations work closely together and the president of O.P.O., Mr. Sam Nujoma, is a member of the executive of SWANU.

However, the Gestapo policies and practices of the Union

Government authorities in South West Africa have made it almost impossible for these organisations to function. Many of the leaders of O.P.O. have been exiled to remote areas of Ovamboland; others have been driven out of the country.

That SWANU and O.P.O. between them express the aspirations of the vast bulk of the indigenous inhabitants of the territory is beyond doubt. Even the traditional chiefs of the various groups, like Hosea Kutako and Samuel Witbooi, have stood firm in the face of every threat and blandishment of the Union Government and have steadfastly called for United Nations intervention.

The day is long past when resolutions and expressions of sympathy from UNO will suffice. Fourteen years of these have not alleviated the lot of the peoples of South West Africa. On the contrary, their burden has become ever more painful to bear. UNO must act in 1961, and act decisively to prise from the grip of the Union Government a stolen territory and a people in thrall.

The military and police apparatus of Union government rule is keeping the people of South West Africa under a system of oppression even more harsh than that of their brothers in the Union. South African freedom fighters owe it to their brothers in South West to give them every possible aid in their struggle to weaken and throw off the forces of the occupying power. Conversely, because of its international position, South West Africa may yet prove to be the Achilles heel of the Union Government. A wound inflicted there could be fatal for apartheid rule in both countries. The struggle of the peoples of the Union and of South West Africa is thus one and the same struggle. Likewise the battle to get effective United Nations pressure and intervention over South West Africa is at the same time part of the battle to break the imperialist grip on the world body, and to enable it to help colonies in the march forward to real independence.

Socialism in Africa

By F. Kumalo

The 60's will go down in history as the decade of the achievement and consolidation of the liberation of the two hundred million peoples of Africa. Centuries of brutal oppression by those who would today pose as the friends of the African people are coming to an end.

In some areas like Algeria the blood of martyrs still flows. In other parts, the peoples' leaders are leaving the political gaols and their places of banishment and stepping into leading positions of government. In yet other parts, such as the Portuguese territories and the Union of South Africa, the iron heel still rules, but the challenge to it grows ever stronger. We live in the area of crumbling colonialism.

The course and rapidity of future progress is a challenge which faces the peoples' movements throughout the continent. When the foreign oppressor has been formally removed from the seats of government; when the national flag flies from the roof tops; when the joyous excitement of independence day celebration is over, what then?

How to tackle the innumerable problems which are the heritage of backwardness imposed by the greed of those who for centuries have plundered a continent and its people? Poverty has left the people disease-ridden and has killed off millions before they achieved adulthood. Imperialist "culture" has degraded people as hewers of wood and drawers of water and left them technically backward and illiterate. The peasant has been robbed of his land and cannot feed himself and his family, let alone the nation. Vast natural resources are as yet untapped, uncharted. There is the crying lack of houses, schools, railways, roads, electricity and power plants.

Centuries of misrule and oppression have left Africa a legacy of backwardness and complex tasks of reconstruction. The very complexity of the problem defies adequate treatment in one short article. Pre-industrial countries must be built into industrial states. There are the problems of land reform, the growing of enough food to feed the people and create an agricultural surplus to help

pay for industrial development. There is the need to diversify the typical colonial economy based on one-crop production and to build basic and secondary industries. Different detailed problems confront each country, but there are some factors common to them all. Basic among these is the need to eliminate all imperialist influence, and, at the same time, to find the capital, from within and outside the newly independent state, with which to develop the economy of the country.

NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE

To whom does the newly-independent African state turn for help in solving these problems? What is the role of the imperialist countries in this period of African reconstruction?

The imperialist leopard has not changed his spots. His retreat from Africa, like his retreat from Asia, is not motivated by a sudden concern for the indigenous peoples. He has been put to flight.

The long and bitter struggles conducted by the African people against imperialism are reaching a climax. The breath-taking rapidity of the changes coming over the continent have in no small measure been made possible by the existence of the powerful anti-imperialist bloc headed by the Soviet Union, and the moral and material assistance it has given in the struggle for the ending of colonial oppression.

But this rapid surge forward to independence does not mean that imperialism is defeated. Colonising countries have found that new techniques of domination are needed. While trying to give the impression that they are voluntarily relinquishing their domination, the big powers of the West with interests in Africa are trying to retain their economic interests and profits. They may withdraw from Government House but investments in mines and plantations remain. The technique of pretending to let go a colony and yet holding on more tightly than ever was never more strikingly demonstrated than by the Belgian manoeuvres and intrigues in the Congo.

A. Davidson writes in "The Downfall of Colonialism in Africa" (International Affairs No 11 of 1960) of the neo-colonialism which "inspired by United States reaction has already worked out in practice and includes a whole arsenal with the most diverse methods: economic domination, conspiracies to overthrow un-submissive governments, setting up puppet regimes, aggravating

discord between the independent African states, peoples, tribes and social groups, finally making use of the United Nations flag and organisation to carry out their colonialist plans, as was the case of the Congo".

The task of developing a sound economy which operates for the benefit of the people demands, in the first place the elimination of all imperialist influence, direct and indirect, Sekou Toure has said explicitly "The peoples of Africa and Asia must clearly tell the buyers and sellers of spheres of influence on these Continents that they intend to determine their own destinies".

THE NEED FOR CAPITAL

The African Continent will overcome backwardness and defeat poverty when all imperialist influence is eliminated and it can plan the proper mobilisation of its resources: both material and human.

One of the first problems confronting a country on the threshold of development is the availability of capital, that is capital in the form of machinery to release the natural riches of the country, agricultural and mineral, and to build up a modern productive industry. Once an industrial base has been set up, capable of making from local materials and labour the equipment required for productive industry, agriculture and transport, that country has achieved real economic independence. This development requires a vast amount of capital investment.

The development of the early capitalist states of Western Europe and their industrialisation took place after an age of acute competition for trade and colonies. Capital was accumulated by piracy on the high seas and plunder of the New World and the spices and riches of the East; and by a series of wars for the redivision of spheres of influence. In earlier centuries war leaders, colonisers and pirates became national heroes, conquering wars were glorified as patriotic efforts to assert the dominance of the invading country and Holland and Britain, France and Germany competed for the carving up of most of the rest of the colonial world. On this conquest and exploitation the highly industrialised nations of Western Europe built their economies.

But countries emerging to independent nationhood and industrialisation in the twentieth century are doing so in a completely different world.

The difference is that state expansion by war is in conflict with the spirit of national self-determination sweeping over humanity.

Even imperialist countries have to attempt to conceal their naked domination of subject peoples by so-called 'development' projects and grants of political self-government. Never before has imperialism on a world scale been as weak as it is in the 'sixties. The major cause of the decline of imperialism is the power and influence of the socialist sector of the world — the Soviet Union, China and the socialist countries of Eastern Europe.

The colonial powers no longer hold the initiative in international affairs. Their every move on the world stage has to be made after calculated consideration of the possible response from the Socialist countries.

The imperialist powers are no longer the dominating influence in our world. The initiative has passed to the socialist sector.

This is particularly noticeable in the prospects opening before the formerly colonial peoples.

As recently as ten year ago Asian countries emerging from colonialism and desperate for capital loans for economic advancement could turn only to their former masters for aid, and what aid was given was shackled by conditions of political alignment in the cold war.

The experience of Asia and Africa has been to "beware of the Greeks when they come bearing gifts".

Aid has been forthcoming from the imperialist countries — but its purpose has been to prevent the fulfilment of the social revolution taking place in Asia and Africa, and to instal forms of neo-colonialism.

"Witness the cases of South Korea, South Vietnam, Formosa, Laos, Pakistan, Iran . . . countries which have received the lion's share of American aid to backward countries, and all of which are today show pieces of economic stagnation and political corruption".

(Monthly Review, January 1960).

Since the end of World War II, United States capital investment in Africa has increased 20 fold, exceeding 2,000 million dollars. But America is interested in Africa not for the sake of the African people, but for her own sake. She sees Africa as a chance to acquire an empire, even though it may not be necessary for her to rule it directly.

The very nature of imperialism militates against unselfish aid in the interests of the colonial people. If the basis of your system is the accumulation of profit, you are a very bad businessman

indeed if you build up a competitor nation with a sound, independent, healthy economy. Therefore imperialist investment is calculated on the basis that it brings a maximum return to the investors.

Apart from private and state investment in Africa, America has also doled out loans and material aid, but again the purpose has been clear: to prevent real independence by making the recipient country dependant on American 'guidance' and political influence, or to turn the country into a military dependency in the build-up of war forces against the Socialist sector of the world.

War bases have been built in Africa which, when it suits the interests of imperialism, could be used against Africa's independence movement. Morocco has six air bases, Libya four, Tanganyika two, Kenya two, with one each in Uganda, Ethiopia and Nigeria. Naval bases have been built in Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, Kenya, Tanganyika.

In past years the American imperialists have been apprehensive about the reliability of the African people as allies in the dangerous game of fostering international conflict. The spirit of anti-imperialism has had too strong a grip on the African continent. So the bulk of American aid has been directed towards underdeveloped countries that can be counted on as reliable allies. Of \$16,140,524 lent by the United States from July 1945 to December 1955, 2.12 per cent. or \$342.713 million dollars went to Africa. Of this amount \$151.719 million dollars went to the Union of South Africa and \$60,686 dollars to the Rhodesias, both among the last remaining outposts of reaction and colonial-type exploitation on the continent. (Figures taken from a report of U.S. representative Frances P. Bolton — 1955 Africa Mission).

By contrast, the record of the Socialist countries has been consistently to foster the growth of real national independence and an end to all forms of colonial oppression.

There is no class in the Soviet Union or China or in any other socialist country which benefits from the exploitation of any group within that society or in outside territories. Socialist aid has not led to the establishment of war bases anywhere. A comparison of foreign aid distributed between 1950 and 1957 by the United States and the Soviet Union shows that the Soviet Union gave $3\frac{1}{2}$ times as much non-military aid, whereas the United States Mutual Security Programme allocated 25 per cent. more on military than on non-military aid.

This is not the only vital difference between aid given by imperialist and socialist countries. In general capitalist aid has been in the form of food and consumer goods. The Soviet Union has given aid chiefly in the form of producer goods and plant for industrial construction which helps to put the recipient country on the road towards economic independence. (See Professor Bernal's **WORLD WITHOUT WAR** for detailed figures).

No wonder that more and more the newly-independent states of Africa are turning to the socialist world for assistance. This is the type of aid which encourages economic independence, not bondage.

Without Socialist aid newly independent countries could be strangled at birth by lack of genuine, unconditional economic aid. This vital role of the Socialist world cannot be over emphasised. And equally important as a source of generous economic aid, the influence of the socialist countries curbs the excesses of imperialism and blocks direct action by the colony-owning countries to prevent the emergence of independent governments. America would long have intervened in Cuba, for example, to smash the popular revolution there, had it not been for the power of the Soviet Union and her allies acting as a restraint.

NEW SYSTEMS IN AFRICA

There is yet another vital factor introduced in the African revolution by the power and strength of the Socialist world, both economically and politically. It brings Socialism in Africa within the realm of possibility not decades and generations off, but in our time.

The dogmatist will say that Marxist theory teaches that socialism is possible only after capitalism, and that Africa must therefore pass through the painful processes of capitalist industrialism before it becomes realistic to talk of an advance to socialism. But Marxist theory also teaches that situations change and that those who cannot adjust to change are left behind.

It is true that there is a developed proletariat in only a few parts of Africa. But in relation to the population, this was true of China, already on the road to socialism. And while many African countries have almost no developed and organised working class they likewise have very small national bourgeoisie and thus weak counter-revolutionary forces to socialism.

Without the intensive industrialisation, economic planning and

build-up of material resources the advance towards socialism, and thereafter communism, cannot come about. But countries building socialism today are no longer dependent only on their own internal resources. The stupendous growth of the resources of the Socialist world makes possible the advance of formerly backward countries towards socialism through the fraternal assistance of the Socialist world.

Socialism is no longer an experiment in one country. It is a world system which is growing stronger by leaps and bounds, whilst its adversary, capitalism, daily grows weaker and more vulnerable. This is a qualitative change in the situation which makes possible, after the gaining of national independence, a rapid advance towards socialism without a country having to traverse the long and painful historical processes which history made inevitable in previous eras.

World Socialism everywhere (including Africa) within our time is no longer a Utopian cry. It is within reach, and inevitable.

On a world scale, and in specific countries, socialism has demonstrated its superiority. The Soviet Union has proved that in a country with almost no industry, a people inspired by socialism could within a generation build an industrial system equal to that of most capitalist countries and now, in the second generation, preparing to outpace the capitalist world. China, since 1949, shows that with a little help from the Soviet Union and socialist countries of Eastern Europe, the transformation can be made even more quickly.

Compare the Soviet Union with the United States of America.

In hearings before the American Joint Economic Committee, Professor Goldsmith, a leading economic authority in America, compared the economic development of these two countries and the following statistics emerged :

In the U.S. the average rate of increase of real Per Capita Gross National Product (a comprehensive index of economic growth) has been $1\frac{5}{8}$ per annum. In the Soviet Union between 1951 and 1958 the figure was from $4\frac{1}{2}$ to 5 per cent. per annum.

Thus the Soviet rate of growth in recent years has been about three times that of the United States. The achievements of a country which inherited a feudal, corrupt Tsarist regime, which was beleaguered by world capitalism in its initial stages and devastated by the German invasion of the Soviet Union at a vital stage in its

growth, proves the overwhelming superiority of the socialist system. There can be no doubt that within a short space of time the Soviet Union will completely overtake the United States in every sphere of economic life.

Socialism has proved itself to be the only economic system capable of mobilising a peoples' total resources for economic development.

Here a comparison between the development of India and China since liberation in these two countries is of paramount importance.

Although the State of India has been forced to play a relatively major role in the national economy, there can be no doubt that basically India is a capitalist State with the private sector still producing 90 per cent. of goods and services.

A comparison of the development of both countries in the American magazine, "Monthly Review — January, 1960" is worth quoting : —

"... The contest between India and China comes as close to meeting the requirements of a laboratory experiment as one is ever likely to find in the realm of social phenomena. The two countries are fairly comparable in size, population, natural resources, standard of living, and stage of economic development. Moreover, they both embarked upon a deliberate programme of economic development at about the same time, roughly 10 years ago. How have they fared?"

Professor Malenbaum ("India and China : Contrasts in Development Performance" — American Economic Review, June, 1959), a man who is apparently far from biased in favour of either China or socialism has the following to say : —

"From 1950 to 1959 India achieved an annual rate of growth of real income of almost 3.5 per cent. Over the same period the Chinese growth rate was 'at least three times as great'. In the field of capital accumulation by the late 1950's the real levels of gross investment in India was approximately double that of 1950; in China it was five times as large.

This achievement, according to Malenbaum's calculations, was made with a simultaneous greater increase of household

consumption in China which, in 1952, was from 10 per cent. to 15 per cent. that of India.

Despite a much higher rate of saving and investment and despite a more rapid growth of population, household consumption levels in China began to forge ahead of India's by 1955 and have steadily widened the gap since.

Malenbaum states :

"The present analysis thus indicates an economic development overwhelmingly favourable to the Chinese effort both with respect to actual performance and to potential for further growth".

Here is a practical illustration of the correctness of the thesis that socialism is a far more effective means of overcoming backwardness and building up a country's resources.

It is true that just as there are problems peculiar to China, so there are problems peculiar to Africa. But whether in Africa or Asia, India or China, an economy based on profit can only hamper development and prevent full progress. On the other hand, a planned socialist economy which mobilises all the resources of a country for the common good, is the most speedy and effective method of overcoming backwardness. This, Africa is rapidly discovering from her own experience in trying to eradicate the roots of backwardness, and become free, independent and prosperous.

Marxist Education Series: No. 1

Why you should be a Communist

By Jalang Kwen

These are times of profound social and political changes, the era of colonial freedom, national independence and counter-revolutions. Nations of the world are today divided and quarrelling among themselves over these important happenings. Many thinking people must be wondering and worried by the ugly spectacle of the crystallisation of these divisions into three great groupings or constellations: the Western imperialist bloc, headed by the United States and Great Britain; the Socialist bloc at the head of which stands the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China; and the neutral bloc consisting of the emergent independent states of Asia and Africa, the so-called "uncommitted nations".

In our opinion these are serious matters, the causes of which it is essential that every political leader, every fighter for freedom and justice, and every honest and sincere person should fully and clearly understand. To be able to change anything one must first know and understand it. We believe therefore that in order to be able to fully appreciate the epoch making events taking place in Africa, Asia and elsewhere one has to have a sound theoretical understanding of the scientific theories and laws of social development.

As far as we are concerned, only the doctrines of Karl Marx give a firm and true foundation of and guide to a proper appreciation of what is happening in the world today. They are the basis upon which is founded the revolutionary working class theory, the scientifically formulated principles and laws of social development. In the words of Lenin: —

"Marxism is the system of views and teachings of Marx. Marx was the genius who continued and completed the three chief ideological currents of the nineteenth century, represented respectively by the three most advanced countries of humanity: classical German philosophy, classical English political economy, and French socialism combined with French revolutionary doctrines. The remarkable consistency and unity of conception of Marx's views, acknowledged even by his

opponents . . . in their totality constitute modern materialism and modern scientific socialism as the theory and programme of the labour movement in all the civilised countries of the world”

According to the Marxist doctrine of dialectical materialist philosophy, “nothing is final, absolute or sacred. It reveals the transitory character of everything and in everything; nothing can endure before it except the uninterrupted process of becoming and of passing away, of endless ascendancy from the lower to the higher. And dialectical philosophy itself is nothing more than the mere reflection of this process in the thinking brain”.

This world view helps us to understand social changes and what is going on in the world around us. We know today that modes of production, like all other things or phenomena, are not static; that they have a beginning, undergo a period of growth and development and then come to an end. This end does not necessarily mean dying out, but includes changing from a lower to the higher form. We also learn that through changes in the modes of production, the whole society or social order changes. On this point Marxism teaches that : —

“The mode of production of the material means of life determines, in general, the social, political, and intellectual processes of life”.

Armed with this revolutionary theory we are able not only to understand what is happening but also to know why, and how to bring about social changes ourselves. Now let us see what social changes took place before. In the long and hard story of his social existence man has had to face many difficult problems. But with the development of technology and productive forces, and the increase of knowledge he has made tremendous progress in all spheres of social life. This has enabled him to solve some of these problems successfully. He has been able to amass enormous wealth and to accumulate vast experience. In modern society there are some people whose riches appear ugly and vulgar when compared with the poverty of their fellow men; and scientific and technological development is such that man is today conquering space and colonising the outer planets.

Yet among the unsolved or partially solved problems are those relating to wealth and experience: questions of poverty and hunger, ignorance and disease, human relationship, war and peace. It is

today estimated that 1,500 million people out of the 2,200 million inhabitants of the earth suffer from lack of proper shelter, enough food and clothing. Horrible diseases are still ravaging mankind; oppression and exploitation of man by man continues, and the scourge of war haunts humanity.

However we are not dealing with this aspect of the matter at present but with changes and development of human society. There was a time when man lived in primitive communal society, a society in which private property was unknown and in which the only means of production, the land, was owned in common. In that society man lived largely by hunting, gathering wild fruits and digging edible roots, while his cultivation of the soil was still scanty and rudimentary. Whenever they had to work, people produced the barest necessities of life. It was a poor society without surplus products, reserves, or public wealth. What the people produced by common labour was shared equally among the producers or participants in the common effort.

Our beloved Africa knows this stage of social development all too well. It existed in several parts of the continent up to the eighteenth century, and it still exists among the Masarwa and Makgalagadi of South Africa, the Masai of East Africa and the Pygmies of Central Africa.

There was no State in primitive communal society even in its advance stage, tribalism. The reasons for this were the absence of private property, of class division of society and of exploitation of man by man. With the improvement of implements of production, cattle breeding and agriculture, and with the growth of handicraft and exchange, however, arose the social division of labour. At this stage the production relations in the society no longer suited the new productive forces. Marxism teaches that :

“No social order is destroyed until all the productive forces for which it gives scope have been developed: new and higher production relations cannot appear until the material conditions for their existence have ripened within the womb of the old social order”.

So in the course of time the elders, military leaders and priests used their official positions to enrich themselves. They imposed heavy fines, acquired a considerable share of the communal property and demanded one or other forms of tribute from the community. They soon became distinct from the mass of the members of the community, forming an aristocracy whose families

became rich while the mass of the population gradually became poor and economically dependent on their rich brethren. This afforded the rich the opportunity for appropriating surplus labour. Advantage was also taken of prisoners of war who were converted into slaves and made to work.

Slaves were seized by the more aristocratic and richer families. Under conditions of class inequality the rich began to convert into slaves not only prisoners of war but also their own impoverished and indebted fellow tribesmen. This is how class division of society came about, the division into slave-owners and slaves. Then there appeared the exploitation of man by man, that is, the appropriation without compensation of the products of the labour of others. Marxists maintain that the whole history of mankind from this period onwards, right up to the building of socialist society, became the history of class struggle.

While social development in Africa also took the classical pattern, in some parts of the continent it does not seem to have followed some of the ugly and inhuman features it took in Europe and elsewhere. The reason for this may be attributed to several causes, among which are : —

- (a) the plentiful and rich pastures;
- (b) enough land for tillage, and the ease with which food to satisfy the people's limited needs was obtained;
- (c) sufficient fuel; and
- (d) the climate which hardly required bodily cover.

Africa has greatly contributed towards the development of human society and culture. But in the interests of political domination and economic exploitation this fact has hitherto been concealed, deliberately distorted or vehemently denied by capitalist and imperialist historians. The wisdom of Egypt, the Upper Nile and Ethiopia was the father of the much vaunted Greek civilisation. Apart from this, Africa traded with and supplied gold, iron and ivory to the ancient world, as well as manpower in the form of slaves.

Not to confuse forms of slavery and their role in the development of society, it should be noted that there were : —

- (a) Domestic slavery which persisted throughout the ages and still exists in some countries of Africa and Asia to this very day. This is a kind of benevolent and humane institution in which in many respects the slave is treated as a member of the household.

- (b) Pre-Christian and pre-Capitalist slavery: the slavery of ancient Egypt, Greece, Rome and the countries of Asia; the slavery that built the pyramids of Egypt, the great splendour of Asia, the monumental works of Greece and the macadamised highways of the Roman Empire. This form of slavery among almost all peoples in the past, and unlike that of the later period was not based on colour or race. White as well as black were both slaves and slave owners.
- (c) The commercial slavery of the Christian-Capitalist era when persons of African origin were sold and owned as if they were cattle, horses or articles of clothing. While in the earlier forms of slavery, as in times of the Egyptians, "Romans and in the feudal ages", the system "was attended by many inhumanities and evils" the later "system which prevailed in the British colonies for upwards of 200 years and in certain parts of the United States up to 1865, attained its highest point of cruelty".

In this article we are dealing with slavery of the pre-Christian and pre-Capitalist era.

Under slavery the population was divided into free men who had all civil, property and political rights, and slaves who were deprived of all these rights. In turn the free were divided into a class of large land-owners, and a class of small producers, peasants and craftsmen, the well-to-do strata of which also made use of slave labour and were slave-owners. The priests were attached to the large land-owners.

The division of society into antagonistic classes with conflicting interests necessitated the establishment of a state. The elders and military leaders, some of whom had by this time become kings, princes and rich aristocrats, began to use their power to defend the interests of the rich and propertied upper class. Armed retinues, courts and primitive organisations served this end. In this way and for this purpose the State power arose.

The "separation of handicraft from agriculture, the rise of handicraft as an independent occupation signified the birth of commodity production". The development of handicraft and exchange led to the establishment of towns. "The slave trade was one of the most profitable and flourishing branches of economic activities. On the basis of slave-labour the ancient world achieved considerable economic and cultural development". On the bones of generations of slaves great cultures were created and huge

empires were built, such as those of ancient Egypt, Greece, Rome, etc. As a result of the surplus created by the free labour of the slaves, men found free time to inquire into and develop many branches of knowledge, to build huge monuments, luxurious palaces, fantastic and awe-inspiring temples, as well as military fortifications were built and maintained.

The slave-owning state played a big part in the development and stabilisation of the production relations of the slave-owning society. But the slave-owning mode of production could not create conditions for any further serious technical advancement. Slave labour was distinguished by its extremely low productivity. Yet slavery, as can be seen above, played an essential part in the development of society and culture.

In addition to having become a hindrance to productive forces, the system fell in most countries because of numerous and serious slave revolts.

The feudal mode of production, which gave some scope for the further development of the productive forces of society, replaced the slave-owning mode of production. With the introduction of the new system the form of exploitation changed. Although there were many large workshops and trade developed further, agriculture played a predominant part and tillage was the most important branch of the feudal economy. Huge landholdings which had already passed into the hands of members of the royal retinues and servants, the clerical authorities and the monasteries, were used as the basis of exploitation.

Slave labour was employed on the land, but the incidence of exploitation fell heavily on the poor peasants and the freed slaves, who were turned into serfs and given plots of land to till for themselves on condition that they made their master, the large land-owner, definite money payment or handed over to him a considerable share of the harvest, and fulfilled various types of duties. The severeness of the new form of exploitation, as compared to slavery with its brutality and sordidness, was that unlike slaves who had nothing to do with and did not care about the products of their labour, the serfs had to fend for themselves and be responsible for the well-being of their families. They were therefore vitally interested in the products of their labour.

While the serfs groaned under the yoke of exploitation, heavy taxation and hunger, the urban population was also facing other forms of oppression and exploitation. "The towns which had

arisen on the lands of the lay and clerical lords were subject to their authority. Townsmen owed a number of duties to feudal lord, paid him quitrent in kind or money, and were subject to his administration and court". The population of the towns were mainly craftsmen and traders, and the town acted as the centre of commodity production. They soon began to struggle for freedom and independence, against domination of feudal lords. Partly by force, partly by means of purchase, the towns obtained for themselves the right of self-administration, holding courts, minting coinage and collecting taxes.

At that time Europe was divided into numerous small independent states, each of which had its own toll. These tolls created difficulties for trade and for the formation of a national market. In the interests of trade and economic development of society in general it became necessary that the barriers brought about by the feudal separation should be abolished and that a central state be established. The kings took advantage of this demand to establish their dominance. Large national states emerged in the form of absolute monarchies.

The growth of competition from the fugitive serfs who had crowded into the towns, and the struggle against exploitation and oppression by feudal lords caused the craftsmen to unite into guilds. These guilds consisted of master craftsmen, journeymen and apprentices. The guild preserved the exclusive right of their members to engage in that craft, and regulated the process of production: they laid down the length of the working day, determined the number of journeymen and apprentices with each master, defined the quality of raw materials and finished products and their prices, and frequently purchased raw materials in common.

At first the guilds played a certain positive part in assisting the strengthening and development of urban crafts. But "with the growth of commodity production and the expansion of the market, the guilds gradually became a brake on the development of productive forces. The strict regulation of craft production by the guilds fettered the craftsmen's initiative and hindered the development of technique". To limit competition they began to create all sorts of hindrances to those wishing to receive the rights of a master. "For the apprentices and journeymen, whose numbers had considerably increased, the possibility of becoming independent masters had practically ceased. They were compelled to remain

for their whole life in the position of hired wage workers”.

The masters intensified the exploitation of their subordinates, making them work fourteen to sixteen hours a day for insignificant pay. As a result “the journeymen began to unite into secret brotherhoods to defend their interests. The guilds and town authorities persecuted the journeymen’s brotherhoods in every way”.

At this stage the Merchant guilds concentrated on the fight against outside competition, the regulation of weights and measures, and on the defence of the merchants’ rights from infringements of the feudal lords.

The development of money relations gave a great impetus to the differentiation of peasantry, i.e. its stratification into different social groups. The overwhelming majority of the peasantry became impoverished, stifled from overwork and were ruined. Side by side with this kulak land-grabbers began to appear in the countryside, exploiting their fellow-villagers by means of loans at extortionate rates and buying up from them agricultural produce, cattle and farm equipment at ruinous prices.

We have already referred to peasants struggles and revolts against the feudal land-owners. These took place throughout the whole period of the feudal system, but they became particularly sharp towards the end of the period. In France and England they took place during the 14th century, in Germany in the 16th century, in Russia during the 17th and 18th centuries. But in China the struggles and uprisings took place throughout the centuries. The peasants did not have a well-knit organisation and at first they had no programme. Later, however, they demanded the suppression of serf slavery, the abolition of feudal privileges, and the establishment of equal rights.

The rising bourgeoisie used the peasants’ struggles and revolts in order to hasten the downfall of the feudal system, to replace feudal exploitation by capitalist exploitation and to take power into its own hands. Yet it was the peasants who formed the basic mass of those who fought against feudalism in the bourgeois revolution. The bourgeois revolution put an end to the feudal mode of production and established capitalist dominance.

“Thus capitalist production came into existence in the womb of the feudal system”.

In the sphere of social development Africa has retrogressed and stagnated as a result of European colonisation and the slave

trade. There was a time when Africa was ahead of Europe in social and cultural development. She could boast of great feudal kingdoms and empires based on trade in iron, gold and diverse wares, kingdoms and empires whose pomp and majesty seemed second to none in the world.

In the next issue of the *African Communist* we shall deal with the further development of society : capitalism, imperialism, socialism and communism.
